'stron

PATENT COOPERATION TREATY

from the NTERNATIONAL PRELIMINARY EXAMINING AUTI	HORITY	REC'D 0 3 FEB 2005					
To: SONG ZHIQIANG, MA HAIMING DEQI INTERLLECTUAL LAW CORPORATION			KC	PCT			
8 Fl.,Golder Plaza, No.10 Huayuan-donglu, Haidian Di	.	WRITTEN OPINION OF THE INTERNATIONAL					
Beijing,100083, P.R.China	\ \	SEARCHING AUTHORITY					
		()	PCT Rule 43 bis.1)				
	-	Date of mailing	0.1	· 2 DD 3			
		(day/month/year 2	005 (27 - 01	. 24 00 00			
Applicant's or agent's file reference	F	REPLY DUE within months/days from					
DF0423126P	nal filing date	the above date of mailing date (day/month/year) Priority date (day/month/year)					
International approaches 110	9 Oct. 2004(09		10 Oct. 2003(1				
International Patent Classification (IPC) or both national							
international Patent Classification (if c) of both march	IPC ⁷ : H04						
Applicant							
HUAWEI TECH	NOLOGIES C	O.,LTD. ETAL					
The state of the s	llowing items:						
This opinion contains indications relating to the form Box No. I Basis of the opinion	mowing nems.	•		İ			
No Roy No II Priority				4.00			
Box No. III Non-establishment of opinio	n with regard t	to novelty, inventive	step and industrial applic	cability			
Box No. IV Lack of unity of invention Box No. V Reasoned statement under Ru	ıle 43 <i>bis</i> .1(a)(i	i)with regard to nove	elty, inventive step or ind	ustrial applicability;			
Box No. V Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis.1(a)(i)with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement							
Box No.VI Certain documents cited							
Box No. VII Certain defects in the international application Box No.VIII Certain observations on the international application							
_							
2. FURTHER ACTION							
If a demand for international preliminary examination is made, this opinion will be considered to be a written opinion of the International Preliminary Examining Authority ("IPEA") except that this does not apply where the applicant chooses an Authority other than this one to be the IPEA and the chosen IPEA has notified the International Bureau under Rule 66.1 bis(b) that written opinions of this International Searching Authority will not be so considered.							
If this opinion is, as provided above, considered to be a written opinion of the IPEA, the applicant is invited to submit to the IPEA a written reply together, where appropriate, with amendments, before the expiration of 3 months from the date of mailing of Form PCT/ISA/220 or before the expiration of 22 months from the priority date, whichever expires later.							
For further options, see Form PCT/ISA/220.							
3. For further details, see notes to Form PCT/ISA/220.							
		Lul awiged officer					
Name and mailing address of the ISA/ 6 Xitucheng Rd., Jimen Bridge, Haidian District,		Authorized officer	GENG XIA OFANG	r			
100088 Beijing, China				.\			
Facsimile No. 86-10-62019451		Telephone No. 80	5-10-62084580				

Form PCT/ISA/237(cover sheet)(January 2004)

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

International application No. PCT/CN2004/001143

Вох	No.	
1.	With whi	h regard to the language, this opinion has been established on the basis of the international application in the language in ich it was filed, unless otherwise indicated under this item.
		This opinion has been established on the basis of a translation from the original language into the following language, which is the language of a translation furnished for the purposes of: international search (under
		Rules 12.3 and 23.1(b))
2.	Witl inve	th regard to any nucleotide and/or amino acid sequence disclosed in the international application and necessary to the claimed rention, this opinion has been established on the basis of:
	a.	type of material a sequence listing table(s) related to the sequence listing
	b.	format of material in written format in computer readable form
	c.	time of filing/furnishing contained in the international application as filed. filed together with the international application in computer readable form. furnished subsequently to this Authority for the purposes of search.
3.		in addition, in the case that more than one version or copy of a sequence listing and/or table relating thereto has been filed or furnished, the required statements that the information in the subsequent or additional copies is identical to that in the application as filed or does not go beyond the application as filed, as appropriate, were furnished.
4.	. A đ	dditional comments:

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE

International application No. PCT/CN2004/001143

INTERNATIONAL SEAR							
Box No. V Reasoned statement under I citations and explanations s	inventive step or industrial applicability;						
1. Statement:							
Novelty (N)	Claims	1-2					
	Claims	3-10					
Inventive step (IS)	Claims	8-9					
	Claims	1-7,10					
Industrial applicability (IA)	Claims	1-10					
	Claims						
Citations and explanations							
D1(EP-A-1337123), D2(WO -A- 02054814)							
Claims 1-7, 10 lack novelty or inventive step.							

1. Claim 1 lacks novelty.

D1 disloses a method of protecting privacy of the location of mobile terminals in a location system, comprising: when a GMLC is waiting for the location result, the GMLC determine whether privacy settings of the target UE terminal has been altered; if this is the case ,the GMLC determines whether cancellation of the location request is require; if cancellation is required, a cancellation request is sent to the SGSN/MSC to cancell the location request (see Par. 38 of column 9- Par. 43 of column 11, Fig.9 and 10).

Therefore, claim1 lack a novelty step.

- 2. Claims 2-7, 10 lack novelty or inventive step
- 1) The subject-matter of Claim 2 is known from D1 because the location request determined is activated in D1.
- 2) The subject-matter of Claim 3 is a matter of course to a person skilled in the art.
- 3) The subject-matter of Claim 4 is a matter of course to a person skilled in the art .Because cancellation of the locaiton request is performed when the privacy settings is altered, so the determination using the privacy settings altered is apparent.
- 4) The subject-matter of Claim 5-6 is generally kown from the prior art.
- 5) The subject-matter of Claim 7-10 merely represents the obviously substitution to error information (Fig. 10).
- 3. Claims 8-9 are considered to be novel and to involve an inventive step because both D1 and D2 do not teach or suggest the subject-matter of claim 8-9.